Docket No.: 47524/P157US/10613152
(PATENT)

IN THE UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

In re Patent Application of:
Charles Hymes et al.

Application No.: 10/633,250   Confirmation No.: 4797

Filed: July 31, 2003   Art Unit: 2179

For: AUTOMATIC MANAGEMENT OF THE   Examiner: T. T. Osberg
       VISUAL SPACE WHILE PERFORMING A
       TASK

APPEAL BRIEF

MS Appeal Brief - Patents
Commissioner for Patents
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, VA 22313-1450

Dear Sir:

As required under § 41.37(a), this brief is filed within two months of the Notice of
Appeal filed concurrently herewith, and is in furtherance of said Notice of Appeal. The fee
required under § 41.20(b)(2) is $250.00 and is dealt with on page 18. This brief contains
items under the following headings as required by 37 C.F.R. § 41.37 and M.P.E.P. § 1205.02:

I.   REAL PARTY IN INTEREST

The real party in interest for this appeal is:

InterVoice Limited Partnership, a limited partnership having its principal place of business in Reno, Nevada, who stands as assignee of the present patent application, and Intervoice, Inc., a Delaware corporation having its principal place of business in Dallas, Texas, who stands as licensee of the present patent application.

II.   RELATED APPEALS AND INTERFERENCES

There are no other appeals, interferences, or judicial proceedings which will directly affect or be directly affected by or have a bearing on the Board's decision in the this appeal.

III.   STATUS OF CLAIMS

A.   Total Number of Claims in Application

There are 29 claims pending in application.

B.   Current Status of Claims

1.   Claims canceled: None.

2.   Claims withdrawn from consideration but not canceled: None.

3.   Claims pending: 1-29.

4.   Claims allowed: None.

5.   Claims rejected: 1-29.

C.   Claims On Appeal

The claims on appeal are claims 1-29.

IV.　STATUS OF AMENDMENTS

Claims 1-24 were originally presented in the application as filed. In response to an Office Action mailed February 21, 2007 rejecting all the pending claims, Appellant submitted an Amendment dated May 18, 2007. The Amendment, which was entered by the Appellee, amended claims 1, 2, 7-9, 13-15, 20, 21, and 24, and submitted new claims 25-29. In response to a Final Office Action mailed July 17, 2007 (*Final Office Action*) rejecting claims 1-29, Appellant submitted the Notice of Appeal filed concurrently with this Appeal Brief.

The claims listed in the "Claims Appendix" reflect the claims as amended by Appellant on May 18, 2007 and as entered by the Appellee. Appellant appeals the rejections set forth in the *Final Office Action*.

V.   SUMMARY OF CLAIMED SUBJECT MATTER

The following provides a concise explanation of the subject matter defined in the independent claim involved in the appeal, referring to the specification by page and line number and to the drawings by reference characters, as required by 37 C.F.R. § 41.37. Each element of the claim is identified by a corresponding reference to the specification and drawings where applicable. However, the citation to passages in the specification and drawings does not imply that the limitations from the specification and drawings should be read into the corresponding claim element.

According to one claimed embodiment, such as that of independent claim 1, a graphical user interface for displaying on an agent's desktop in a contact center comprises a managed display having a task bar (*e.g.*, page 6, line 17—page 7, line 30; figure 2, item 212), wherein the task bar includes at least one managed application (*e.g.*, page 6, line 17—page 7, line 30; figure 2, item 208), at least one icon corresponding to at least one managed application (*e.g.*, page 6, line 17—page 7, line 30; figure 2, item 210), and a managed application display area displaying the at least one managed application corresponding to the at least one icon (*e.g.*, page 6, line 17—page 7, line 30; figure 2, item 206), wherein the at least one icon is selected according to a step of an automated workflow that guides the agent's handling of a contact (*e.g.*, page 8, lines 19-31; figure 3, items 300 and 301), wherein a predetermined set of rules determines the size, placement and visibility of the at least one managed application in the managed application display area when the at least one managed application is selected according to the step of the automated workflow (*e.g.*, page 8, lines 19-31; page 12, lines 1-25).

According to another claimed embodiment, such as that of independent claim 8, a method of managing a visual space of a customer relations management application comprises displaying a managed display having a task bar (*e.g.*, page 6, line 17—page 7, line 30; figure 2, item 212), wherein the task bar includes at least one managed application (*e.g.*, page 6, line 17—page 7, line 30; figure 2, item 208), displaying at least one icon corresponding to each one of the at least one managed applications (*e.g.*, page 6, line 17—page 7, line 30; figure 2, item 210), and displaying an automated workflow that defines a plurality of steps for controlling the handling of a customer call the automated workflow

having at least one step corresponding to each one of the at least one icon where one of the at least one icon is selected according to the corresponding step of the automated workflow and where the managed application corresponding to the selected icon is displayed in a managed application display area (*e.g.*, page 6, line 17—page 7, line 30; page 8, lines 19-31; figure 3, items 300 and 301), wherein a predetermined set of rules determines the size, placement and visibility of the at least one managed application in the managed application display area when the at least one managed application is selected according to the at least one step of the automated workflow (*e.g.*, page 8, lines 19-31; page 12, lines 1-25).

According to another claimed embodiment, such as that of independent claim 14, in a system having a central processor, a display, a memory and an input device, a graphical user interface for displaying an agent's desktop in a contact center (*e.g.*, page 4, line 20—page 5, line 6) comprising a managed display having a task bar (*e.g.*, page 6, line 17—page 7, line 30; figure 2, item 212), wherein the task bar includes at least one managed application (*e.g.*, page 6, line 17—page 7, line 30; figure 2, item 208), at least one icon corresponding to each one of the at least one managed applications (*e.g.*, page 6, line 17—page 7, line 30; figure 2, item 210), and an automated workflow defining a plurality of steps for controlling the agent's handling of a contact and having at least one step corresponding to each one of the at least one icon, wherein one of the at least one icon is selected according to the corresponding step of the automated workflow (*e.g.*, page 8, lines 19-31; figure 3, items 300 and 301), and the managed application corresponding to the selected icon is displayed in a managed application display area (*e.g.*, page 6, line 17—page 7, line 30; figure 2, item 206), wherein a predetermined set of rules determines the size, placement and visibility of the at least one managed application in the managed application display area when the at least one managed application is selected according to the at least one step of the automated workflow (*e.g.*, page 8, lines 19-31; page 12, lines 1-25).

According to yet another claimed embodiment, such as that of independent claim 21, a graphical user interface for displaying on an agent's desktop in a contact center comprises a quick start bar, wherein the quick start bar includes at least one non-managed application (*e.g.*, page 9, line 21—page 10, line 4; figure 2, item 214), a contact center control panel illustrating current contact information, wherein the information indicates a type of call

placed by the current contact to the contact center (*e.g.*, page 6, line 17—page 7, line 5; page 9, lines 11-20; figure 2, item 202), a managed display having a task bar (*e.g.*, page 6, line 17—page 7, line 30; figure 2, item 212), wherein the task bar includes at least one managed application (*e.g.*, page 6, line 17—page 7, line 30; figure 2, item 208), at least one icon corresponding to each one of the at least one managed applications (*e.g.*, page 6, line 17—page 7, line 30; figure 2, item 210), a managed application display area, wherein a predetermined set of rules determines the size, placement and visibility of the at least one managed application in the managed application display area (*e.g.*, page 6, line 17—page 7, line 30; figure 2, item 206); and an automated workflow defining a plurality of steps for controlling the agent's handling of the current contact and having at least one step corresponding to each one of the at least one icon (*e.g.*, page 8, lines 19-31; figure 3, items 300 and 301), wherein one of the at least one icon is selected according to the corresponding step of the automated workflow and the type of call indicated by the contact center control pane (*e.g.*, page 6, line 17—page 7, line 30; figure 2, item 210), and the managed application corresponding to the selected icon is displayed in the managed application display area, further wherein the managed application corresponding to the selected icon is selectively displayed outside of the managed display area (*e.g.*, page 6, line 17—page 7, line 30; page 8, lines 19-31; page 9, line 21—page 10, line 4).

According to still another claimed embodiment, such as that of independent claim 26, a method for managing a graphical user interface of an agent's desktop in a contact center comprises receiving a call at the contact center, the call having one of a plurality of media types (*e.g.*, page 12, line 1—page 13, line 3), automatically opening one or more applications on the agent's desktop suitable for aiding the agent in handling the call depending, at least in part, upon the one media type (*e.g.*, page 12, line 1—page 13, line 3), and automatically reconfiguring the appearance of the graphical user interface as the agent follows steps of a pre-programmed call handling workflow (*e.g.*, page 8, lines 19-31; page 12, line 1—page 13, line 3; figure 3, items 300 and 301).

VI.   GROUNDS OF REJECTION TO BE REVIEWED ON APPEAL

A.   Claims 1-3, 5-10, 12-16, and 18-20 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 102(b) as being anticipated by U.S. Patent No. 6,072,486 (*Sheldon*).

B.   Claims 4, 11, and 17 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over *Sheldon* in view of U.S. Patent Application Publication No. 2006/0136843 (*Shafron*).

C.   Claims 21-25 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over *Sheldon* in view of *Shafron* and further in view of U.S. Patent No. 7,167,899 (*Lee*).

D.   Claims 26-29 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over *Sheldon* in view of *Lee*.

VII.   ARGUMENT

Appellant traverses the outstanding rejections of the pending claims, and respectfully requests that the Board reverse these rejections in light of the remarks contained herein. The claims do not stand or fall together. Accordingly, Appellant presents separate arguments for several claims. Each of the separately argued claims are presented with separate headings and sub-heading in accordance with 37 C.F.R. § 41.37(c)(1)(vii).

A.   Claim Rejections Under § 102 over *Sheldon*

Claims 1-3, 5-10, 12-16, and 18-20 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 102(b) as being unpatentable over *Sheldon*. *Final Office Action* at p. 2. In order to anticipate a claim under 35 U.S.C. § 102, a single reference must teach each and every element of the claim. *See Verdegaal Bros. v. Union Oil Co. of California*, 814 F.2d 628, 631 (Fed. Cir. 1987). Appellant respectfully submits that *Sheldon* fails to teach each and every element of claims 1-3, 5-10, 12-16, and 18-20, and respectfully requests that the Board reverse these rejections.

1.   Independent Claim 1 and Dependent Claims 2, 3, and 5-7

Independent claim 1 recites that: "*the at least one icon is selected according to a step of an automated workflow that guides the agent's handling of a contact.*" Appellant notes that *Sheldon* is not at all concerned with the handling of a contact by an agent. *See generally Sheldon*. In fact, the portion of *Sheldon* cited by Appellee in support for this rejection only describes a "state diagram" of "a method by which a computer customizes an existing deskbar." *Id.* at col. 4, lns. 45-50; figure 21, *cited in Final Office Action* at p. 3. Therefore, Appellant respectfully asserts that *Sheldon* does not teach an icon selected according to a step of an automated workflow that guides an agent's handling of a contact, as recited in claim 1. At least for this reason, Appellant respectfully requests that the 35 U.S.C. § 102(b) rejection of record with respect to claim 1 be reversed.

Independent claim 1 also recites that: "*a predetermined set of rules determines the size, placement and visibility of the at least one managed application in the managed application display area when the at least one icon is selected according to a step of an automated workflow.*" Because *Sheldon* does not describe an automated workflow that

guides an agent's handling of a contact, it does not describe a set of rules that determines a size, placement, and visibility of a contact center managed application when an icon is selected according to the automated workflow. At least for this reason, Appellant respectfully requests that the 35 U.S.C. § 102(b) rejection of record with respect to claim 1 be reversed.

Dependent claims 2, 3, and 5-7 depend from independent claim 1, and thus inherit all the limitations of that independent claim. As noted above, *Sheldon* does not teach every element of independent claim 1. Consequently, *Sheldon* also fails to teach every element of dependent claims 2, 3, and 5-7. Accordingly, Appellant respectfully requests that the 35 U.S.C. § 102(b) rejection of record with respect to claims 2, 3, and 5-7 be reversed.

2.   Independent Claim 8 and Dependent Claims 9, 10, 12 and 13

Independent claim 8 recites: *"displaying an automated workflow that defines a plurality of steps for controlling the handling of a customer call."* Appellant notes that *Sheldon* is not at all concerned with the handling a customer call. *See generally Sheldon.* In fact, the portion of *Sheldon* cited by Appellee in support for this rejection only describes a "state diagram" of "a method by which a computer customizes an existing deskbar." *Id.* at col. 4, lns. 45-50; figure 21, *cited in Final Office Action* at p. 5. In addition, there is no indication that *Sheldon*'s "state diagram" is itself displayed, as recited in claim 8. Therefore, Appellant respectfully asserts that *Sheldon* does not teach displaying an automated workflow that defines a plurality of steps for controlling the handling of a customer call. At least for these reasons, Appellant respectfully requests that the 35 U.S.C. § 102(b) rejection of record with respect to claim 8 be reversed.

Independent claim 8 also recites that: *"a predetermined set of rules determines the size, placement and visibility of the at least one managed application in the managed application display area when the at least one managed application is selected according to the at least one step of the automated workflow [that defines a plurality of steps for controlling the handling of a customer call]."* Because *Sheldon* is not concerned with the handling a customer call, it does not teach a predetermined set of rules that determines the size, placement and visibility of the at least one managed application in the managed

application display area when the at least one managed application is selected according to the at least one step of the automated workflow. At least for this reason, Appellant respectfully requests that the 35 U.S.C. § 102(b) rejection of record with respect to claim 8 be reversed.

Dependent claims 9, 10, 12 and 13 depend from independent claim 8, and thus inherit all the limitations of that independent claim. As noted above, *Sheldon* does not teach every element of independent claim 8. Consequently, *Sheldon* also fails to teach every element of dependent claims 9, 10, 12 and 13. Accordingly, Appellant respectfully requests that the 35 U.S.C. § 102(b) rejection of record with respect to claims 9, 10, 12 and 13 be reversed.

3.   Independent Claim 14 and Dependent Claims 15, 16, and 18-20

Independent claim 14 recites: "*an automated workflow defining a plurality of steps for controlling the agent's handling of a contact.*" Again, Appellant notes that *Sheldon* is not at all concerned with the handling of a contact by an agent. *See generally Sheldon.* In fact, the portion of *Sheldon* cited by Appellee in support for this rejection only describes a "state diagram" of "a method by which a computer customizes an existing deskbar." *Id.* at col. 4, lns. 45-50; figure 21, *cited in Final Office Action* at pp. 6 and 7. Therefore, Appellant respectfully asserts that *Sheldon* does not teach an automated workflow defining a plurality of steps for controlling the agent's handling of a contact. At least for this reason, Appellant respectfully requests that the 35 U.S.C. § 102(b) rejection of record with respect to claim 14 be reversed.

Independent claim 14 further recites that: "*a predetermined set of rules determines the size, placement and visibility of the at least one managed application in the managed application display area when the at least one managed application is selected according to the at least one step of the automated workflow [that defines a plurality of steps for controlling the agent's handling of a contact].*" Because *Sheldon* is not concerned with agent's handling of a contact, it does not teach a predetermined set of rules determines the size, placement and visibility of the at least one managed application in the managed application display area when the at least one managed application is selected according to the at least one step of the automated workflow, as recited in claim 14. At least for this

reason, Appellant respectfully requests that the 35 U.S.C. § 102(b) rejection of record with respect to claim 14 be reversed.

Dependent claims 15, 16, and 18-20 depend from independent claim 14, and thus inherit all the limitations of that independent claim. As noted above, *Sheldon* does not teach every element of independent claim 14. Consequently, *Sheldon* also fails to teach every element of dependent claims 15, 16, and 18-20. Accordingly, Appellant respectfully requests that the 35 U.S.C. § 102(b) rejection of record with respect to claims 15, 16, and 18-20 be reversed.

B.   Claim Rejections Under § 103 over *Sheldon* and *Shafron*

Claims 4, 11, and 17 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over *Sheldon* in view of *Shafron*. Appellant respectfully traverses and requests that the Board reverse these rejections for the reasons stated below.

It is well settled that "[t]he examiner bears the initial burden of factually supporting any *prima facie* case of obviousness. If the examiner does not produce a *prima facie* case, the applicant is under no obligation to submit evidence of nonobviousness." M.P.E.P. § 2142. To make a *prima facie* case of obviousness, the Examiner must determine the "scope and content of the prior art," ascertain the "differences between the prior art and the claims at issue," determine "the level of ordinary skill in the pertinent art," and evaluate evidence of secondary considerations. *Graham v. John Deere*, 383 U.S. 1, 17, (1966); *KSR Int'l Co. v. Teleflex Inc.*, 550 U.S. ___ (2007); *see also* M.P.E.P. § 2141. When determining the differences between the prior art and the claims, the question under 35 U.S.C. 103 is not whether the differences themselves would have been obvious, but whether the claimed invention as a whole would have been obvious. M.P.E.P. § 2141.02(I).

Lack of All Claimed Elements

Dependent claims 4, 11, and 17 depend from independent claims 1, 8, and 14, respectively, each dependent claim thus inheriting every element of its respective independent claim. As noted above, *Sheldon* does not teach or suggest every element of independent claims 1, 8, and 14. Appellee does not rely upon *Shafron* as curing *Sheldon*'s

deficiencies, and Appellant asserts that *Shafron* does not do so. As such, the combination of *Sheldon* with *Shafron* fails to teach or suggest every element of independent claims 1, 8, and 14. Consequently, the combination of *Sheldon* and *Shafron* also fails to teach or suggest every element of dependent claims 4, 11, and 17. Moreover, dependent claims 4, 11, and 17 recite further elements not taught or suggested by the combination of *Sheldon* with *Shafron*.

For example, claims 4, 11, and 17 recite: "***a contact center control panel illustrating current contact information.***" Appellee admits that *Sheldon* does not teach or suggest this feature, and relies solely upon *Shafron* as providing such feature. *Final Office Action* at p. 9. However, the potion of *Shafron* cited by Appellee describes, in relevant part:

> [a]n interface object 40 [added] to the browser interface 20 that permits a user to download their "address book" from of [sic] a database located on the internet.

Shafron at ¶ [0102]. Appellant respectfully asserts that merely displaying information from a remotely located "address book" via a browser interface is not the same as the claimed feature. In contrast with *Shafron*'s address book information, the "current contact information" recited in the claims is that of a contact being handled by an agent at a contact center. *See* independent claims 1, 8, and 14. Neither *Sheldon* nor *Shafron*, taken alone or in combination, teaches or suggests a contact center control panel illustrating current contact information. Accordingly, Appellant respectfully requests that the 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) rejection of record with respect to claims 4, 11, and 17 be reversed.

C.   Claim Rejections Under § 103 over *Sheldon*, *Shafron*, and *Lee*

Claims 21-25 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over *Sheldon* in view of *Shafron* and further in view of *Lee*. Appellant respectfully traverses and requests that the Board reverse these rejections for the reasons stated below.

Lack of All Claimed Elements

Independent claim 21 recites: "***an automated workflow defining a plurality of steps for controlling the agent's handling of the current contact and having at least one step corresponding to each one of the at least one icon.***" Appellee relies solely upon *Sheldon* as teaching or suggesting this claimed element. *Final Office Action* at p. 10. However, *Sheldon*

is not at all concerned with the handling of a contact by an agent. *See generally Sheldon*. In fact, the portion of *Sheldon* cited by Appellee in support for this rejection only describes a "state diagram" of "a method by which a computer customizes an existing deskbar." *Id.* at col. 4, lns. 45-50; figure 21, *cited in Final Office Action* at p. 10. Therefore, Appellant respectfully asserts that *Sheldon* does not teach an automated workflow defining a plurality of steps for controlling the agent's handling of a contact. Appellee does not rely upon *Shaffron* or *Lee* as teaching or suggesting the claimed feature, and Appellant asserts that they do not do so. Therefore, the combination of *Sheldon* with *Shafron* and *Lee* does not teach or suggest every element recited in the claim. At least for this reason, Appellant respectfully requests that the 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) rejection of record with respect to claim 21 be reversed.

Dependent claims 22-25 depend from independent claim 21, and thus inherit all the limitations of that independent claim. As noted above, the combination of *Sheldon* with *Shafron* and *Lee* does not teach or suggest every element of independent claim 21. Thus, the combination of *Sheldon* with *Shafron* and *Lee* also fails to teach or suggest every element of dependent claims 22-25. Accordingly, Appellant respectfully requests that the 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) rejection of record with respect to claims 22-25 be reversed.

D.   Claim Rejections Under § 103 over *Sheldon* and *Lee*

Claims 26-29 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over *Sheldon* in view of *Lee*. Appellant respectfully traverses and requests that the Board reverse these rejections for the reasons stated below.

Lack of All Claimed Elements

1.   Independent Claim 26 and Dependent Claim 29

Independent claim 26 recites: *"automatically re-configuring the appearance of the graphical user interface as the agent follows steps of a pre-programmed call handling workflow."* Appellee relies solely upon *Sheldon* as teaching or suggesting this claimed feature. *Final Office Action* at p. 13. However, *Sheldon* is not at all concerned with the handling of a call. *See generally Sheldon*. In fact, the portion of *Sheldon* cited by Appellee in support for this rejection only describes a "state diagram" of "a method by which a

computer customizes an existing deskbar." *Id.* at col. 4, lns. 45-50; figure 21, *cited in Final Office Action* at p. 13. Therefore, Appellant respectfully asserts that *Sheldon* does not teach or suggest an agent following steps of a pre-programmed call handling workflow, much less automatically re-configuring the appearance of the graphical user interface as the agent follows steps of the workflow. Appellee does not rely upon *Lee* as teaching or suggesting the claimed feature, and Appellant asserts that it does not do so. Therefore, the combination of *Sheldon* with *Lee* does not teach or suggest every element recited in the claim. At least for this reason, Appellant respectfully requests that the 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) rejection of record with respect to claim 26 be reversed.

Dependent claim 29 depends from independent claim 26, and thus inherit all the limitations of that independent claim. As noted above, the combination of *Sheldon* with *Lee* does not teach or suggest every element of independent claim 26. Thus, the combination of *Sheldon* with *Lee* also fails to teach or suggest every element of dependent claim 29. Accordingly, Appellant respectfully requests that the 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) rejection of record with respect to claim 29 be reversed.

2.   Dependent Claim 27

Dependent claim 27 recites: "*automatically re-sizing one or more applications, at least in part, as a function of a number of simultaneously open applications.*" Appellee relies solely upon *Sheldon* as teaching or suggesting this claimed feature. *Final Office Action* at p. 13. However, the portion of *Sheldon* cited by Appellee only states, in relevant part, that:

> [r]esizing the deskbar may result in automatic rearrangement of the deskband icons . . . . For example, in FIG. 12, the deskbar 710 is resized. Consequently, the icons 720 are automatically rearranged by the bandsite such as the icons 720 now appear in one row, as opposed to two rows as shown in FIG. 11.

Sheldon at p. 18, lns. 29-36. This passage does not teach or suggest the automatically re-sizing one or more applications, much less at least in part a function of a number of simultaneously open applications. Appellee does not rely upon *Lee* as teaching or suggesting the claimed feature, and Appellant asserts that it does not do so. Therefore, the combination of *Sheldon* and *Lee* does not teach or suggest all claimed elements. At least for this reason,

Appellant respectfully requests that the 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) rejection of record with respect to claim 27 be reversed.

3.   Dependent Claim 28

Dependent claim 28 recites: *"automatically closing one or more applications as the agent follows the steps of the pre-programmed call handling workflow."* Appellee relies solely upon *Sheldon* as teaching or suggesting this claimed feature. *Final Office Action* at p. 14. However, the portion of *Sheldon* cited by Appellee only states, in relevant part, that:

> [r]esizing the deskbar may result in automatic rearrangement of
> the deskband icons . . . . For example, in FIG. 12, the deskbar
> 710 is resized. Consequently, the icons 720 are automatically
> rearranged by the bandsite such as the icons 720 now appear in
> one row, as opposed to two rows as shown in FIG. 11.

Sheldon at p. 18, lns. 29-36. This passage does not teach or suggest automatically closing one or more applications, much less automatically closing one or more applications as the agent follows the steps of the pre-programmed call handling workflow. Appellee does not rely upon *Lee* as teaching or suggesting the claimed feature, and Appellant asserts that it does not do so. Therefore, the combination of *Sheldon* and *Lee* does not teach or suggest all claimed elements. At least for this reason, Appellant respectfully requests that the 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) rejection of record with respect to claim 28 be reversed.

CONCLUSION

In view of the foregoing, Appellant respectfully requests withdrawal of the final rejection, reopening of prosecution, and allowance of the above-captioned application. Should Appellee not find the comments contained herein persuasive, acknowledgement of receipt and entry of this Appeal Brief are respectfully requested.

Applicant believes that a fee of $250.00 is due with the Appeal Brief and is being paid by credit card. The Director is hereby authorized to charge any deficiency in the fees filed, asserted to be filed, or which should have been filed herewith (or with any paper hereafter filed in this application by this firm) to Deposit Account No. 06-2380, under Order No. 47524-P157US-10613152 from which the undersigned is authorized to draw.

Dated: September 26, 2007   Respectfully submitted,

I hereby certify that this paper (along with any paper referred to as being attached or enclosed) is being transmitted via the Office electronic filing system in accordance with § 1.6(a)(4).

Dated: September 26, 2007

Signed: Joy H. Perigo

By _R. Ross Viguet_

R. Ross Viguet
Registration No.: 42,203
FULBRIGHT & JAWORSKI L.L.P.
2200 Ross Avenue, Suite 2800
Dallas, Texas 75201-2784
(214) 855-8185
(214) 855-8200 (Fax)
Attorney for Appellant

VIII. CLAIMS APPENDIX

1.   A graphical user interface for displaying on an agent's desktop in a contact center, comprising:

a.   a managed display having a task bar, wherein the task bar includes at least one managed application;

b.   at least one icon corresponding to at least one managed application; and

c.   a managed application display area displaying the at least one managed application corresponding to the at least one icon, wherein the at least one icon is selected according to a step of an automated workflow that guides the agent's handling of a contact, and

wherein a predetermined set of rules determines the size, placement and visibility of the at least one managed application in the managed application display area when the at least one managed application is selected according to the step of the automated workflow.

2.   The graphical user interface as claimed in claim 1 further wherein the managed application corresponding to the selected icon is displayed outside of the managed application display area.

3.   The graphical user interface as claimed in claim 1 further comprising a quick start bar, wherein the quick start bar includes at least one non-managed application.

4.   The graphical user interface as claimed in claim 1 further comprising a contact center control panel illustrating current contact information.

5.   The graphical user interface as claimed in claim 1 wherein the graphical user interface is displayed on the agent desktop having a display and an input device.

6.   The graphical user interface as claimed in claim 5 wherein the input device is used to selectively input data in to any one of the at least one managed applications.

7.   The graphical user interface as claimed in claim 1 wherein when the agent selects any of the at least one icon, the corresponding managed application is displayed in the managed application display area.

8.　　A method of managing a visual space of a customer relations management application, the method comprising:

a.　　displaying a managed display having a task bar, wherein the task bar includes at least one managed application;

b.　　displaying at least one icon corresponding to each one of the at least one managed applications; and

c.　　displaying an automated workflow that defines a plurality of steps for controlling the handling of a customer call, the automated workflow having at least one step corresponding to each one of the at least one icon, wherein one of the at least one icon is selected according to the corresponding step of the automated workflow, and wherein the managed application corresponding to the selected icon is displayed in a managed application display area,

wherein a predetermined set of rules determines the size, placement and visibility of the at least one managed application in the managed application display area when the at least one managed application is selected according to the at least one step of the automated workflow.

9.　　The method as claimed in claim 8 further wherein the managed application corresponding to the selected icon is displayed outside of the managed application display area.

10.　　The method as claimed in claim 8 further comprising displaying a quick start bar, wherein the quick start bar includes at least one non-managed application.

11.　　The method as claimed in claim 8 further comprising displaying a contact center control panel illustrating current contact information.

12.　　The method as claimed in claim 8 further comprising selectively inputting data in to any one of the least one managed applications.

13.　　The method as claimed in claim 8 further comprising selecting any of the at least one icon thereby displaying the corresponding managed application in the managed application display area.

14.   In a system having a central processor, a display, a memory and an input device, a graphical user interface for displaying an agent's desktop in a contact center, comprising:

a.   a managed display having a task bar, wherein the task bar includes at least one managed application;

b.   at least one icon corresponding to each one of the at least one managed applications; and

c.   an automated workflow defining a plurality of steps for controlling the agent's handling of a contact and having at least one step corresponding to each one of the at least one icon, wherein one of the at least one icon is selected according to the corresponding step of the automated workflow, and the managed application corresponding to the selected icon is displayed in a managed application display area,

wherein a predetermined set of rules determines the size, placement and visibility of the at least one managed application in the managed application display area when the at least one managed application is selected according to the at least one step of the automated workflow.

15.   The system as claimed in claim 14 further wherein the managed application corresponding to the selected icon is displayed outside of the managed application display area.

16.   The system as claimed in claim 14 further comprising a quick start bar, wherein the quick start bar includes at least one non-managed application.

17.   The system as claimed in claim 14 further comprising a contact center control panel illustrating current contact information.

18.   The system as claimed in claim 14 wherein the graphical user interface is displayed on the agent desktop having a display and an input device.

19.   The system as claimed in claim 18 wherein the input device is used to selectively input data in to any one of the at least one managed applications.

20.   The system as claimed in claim 14 wherein when the agent selects any of the at least one icon, the corresponding managed application is displayed in the managed application display area.

21.   A graphical user interface for displaying on an agent's desktop in a contact center, comprising:

a.   a quick start bar, wherein the quick start bar includes at least one non-managed application;

b.   a contact center control panel illustrating current contact information, wherein the information indicates a type of call placed by the current contact to the contact center;

c.   a managed display having a task bar, wherein the task bar includes at least one managed application;

d.   at least one icon corresponding to each one of the at least one managed applications;

e.   a managed application display area, wherein a predetermined set of rules determines the size, placement and visibility of the at least one managed application in the managed application display area; and

f.   an automated workflow defining a plurality of steps for controlling the agent's handling of the current contact and having at least one step corresponding to each one of the at least one icon,

wherein one of the at least one icon is selected according to the corresponding step of the automated workflow and the type of call indicated by the contact center control panel, and the managed application corresponding to the selected icon is displayed in the managed application display area, further wherein the managed application corresponding to the selected icon is selectively displayed outside of the managed display area.

22.   The graphical user interface as claimed in claim 21 wherein the graphical user interface is displayed on the agent desktop having a display and an input device.

23.   The graphical user interface as claimed in claim 22 wherein the input device is used to selectively input data in to any one of the least one managed applications.

24. The graphical user interface as claimed in claim 23 wherein when the agent selects any of the at least one icon, the corresponding managed application is displayed in the managed application display area.

25. The graphical user interface as claimed in claim 23, wherein the type of call is selected from the group consisting of: voice, e-mail, web collaboration, and chat.

26. A method for managing a graphical user interface of an agent's desktop in a contact center, the method comprising:

 receiving a call at the contact center, the call having one of a plurality of media types;

 automatically opening one or more applications on the agent's desktop suitable for aiding the agent in handling the call depending, at least in part, upon the one media type; and

 automatically re-configuring the appearance of the graphical user interface as the agent follows steps of a pre-programmed call handling workflow.

27. The method of claim 26, wherein automatically re-configuring comprises automatically re-sizing one or more applications, at least in part, as a function of a number of simultaneously open applications.

28. The method of claim 27, wherein automatically re-configuring comprises automatically closing one or more applications as the agent follows the steps of the pre-programmed call handling workflow.

29. The graphical user interface as claimed in claim 26, wherein the one of the plurality of media types is selected from the group consisting of: voice, e-mail, web collaboration, and chat.

IX.   EVIDENCE APPENDIX

No evidence pursuant to §§ 1.130, 1.131, or 1.132 or entered by or relied upon by the examiner is being submitted.

X.   RELATED PROCEEDINGS APPENDIX

No related proceedings are referenced above, and thus copies of decisions in related proceedings are not provided.